

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST

PROPOSITION 3

Rebuttal Ballot Argument in Favor of Proposition 3

The opponents of our Children's Hospitals say, "bonded indebtedness for anything but the most essential infrastructure is unwise."

We ask you, what is more essential than investing in hospitals where over one million times each year California children are treated for traumatic injuries and illnesses like cancer, leukemia, heart defects, sickle cell anemia and cystic fibrosis? What infrastructure is more vital than the technology and facilities for neonatal care and organ transplants for children?

Proposition 3 is an investment in the health of California children whose lives will be saved over the next 30 years.

The university and nonprofit, charitable Children's Hospitals that meet the strict eligibility standards of Proposition 3 are 100% dedicated to the most seriously ill and injured kids in California. Children's Hospital Bond funds are rigorously accounted for and controlled by the State Treasurer. And Proposition 3 – with principle and interest – is one of the smallest bonds ever.

These opponents cross the line when they attack the integrity of the people who have dedicated their lives to saving our children. These three men recklessly argue that the people who do this good work will "benefit directly, personally and monetarily" from the

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST

PROPOSITION 3

bond. Their whole argument is mean-spirited, hypocritical, and untrue. Proposition 3 is a sound investment with a return that is . . . priceless.

Parents of seriously ill children, like us, appreciate the value of California's Children's Hospitals. Our children received the specialized care they needed and couldn't get anywhere else.

Please vote Yes on 3.

Robin Meeks

Parent

Mindy Vazquez

Parent

Diane Gibson

Parent